

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed September 11, 2007.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesy of an interview with Examiners Daquan Zhao and Thai Tran on October 10, 2007. During the interview the participants discussed various amendments to Claim 1 to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 and 35 U.S.C. §103, the substance of which amendments are included fully herein.

I. Summary of Interview

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesy of an interview with Examiners Daquan Zhao and Thai Tran on October 10, 2007. During the interview the participants discussed various amendments to Claim 1 to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 and 35 U.S.C. §103

Applicant's representative proposed changing "full motion video" to "multimedia stream" and proposed adding the term "without user input" into the claim to overcome the rejections. It was stated during the interview that the proposed amendments would overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 and the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections in the Final Rejection.

II. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed on September 11, 2007, Claims 1-4 and 6-20 were pending. In the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun (US 6,931,594 B1) (hereinafter "Jun") and further in view of Bhagavath et al (US 6,829,781 B1) (hereinafter "Bhagavath"). Claims 9, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun and Bhagavath, and further in view of Li et al (US 7,035,435) (hereinafter "Li").

III. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 1, 19 and 20. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented claims or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

IV. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In response, “full motion video” has been amended to read “multimedia streams.” During the interview, it was stated that this amendment would likely be sufficient to overcome the rejection. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the claims as discussed during the interview. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun and further in view of Bhagavath. Claims 9, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun and Bhagavath, and further in view of Li.

Claim 1

During the interview, Applicant’s representative proposed adding the term “without user input” into Claim 1 to overcome the rejections. It was stated during the interview that the proposed amendments would likely overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection in the Final Rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 1 as discussed during the interview. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references given the amendments and the comments provided above, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 and 20

Independent Claims 19 and 20 have been amended similar to Claim 1 to more clearly define the embodiment therein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 19 and 20, as amended, are likewise not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 6-18

Claims 2-4 and 6-18 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully

submits that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Dec. 5, 2007

By: /Rex Hwang/
Rex Hwang
Reg. No. 56206

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800